

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

7 JULIE DALESSIO, )  
8 Plaintiff, ) CASE NO. C17-0642RSM  
9 v. )  
10 ) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S  
THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, ) MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
11 )  
12 Defendant. )  
13 \_\_\_\_\_ )

14 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt.  
15 #22. Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its prior ruling denying her motion to strike certain  
16 portions of the Joint Status Report submitted by Defendant in this action. *Id.* Plaintiff argues  
17 that this Court should have allowed her to present additional reasons why the material should  
18 have been stricken, and that the reasons she did not sign the Joint Status Report were not  
19 accurately represented to the Court. *Id.*

21 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” LCR 7(h). “The court will ordinarily deny  
22 such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of  
23 new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with  
24 reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). In this case, the Court is not persuaded that it committed  
25 manifest error in its ruling. Plaintiff appears to misconstrue the purpose of the Joint Status  
26 Report. *See* Dkts. #22 and #23. While she disputes at length the reasons why she did not sign  
27 the Joint Status Report that was filed by Defendant, and asks the Court to strike the Defendant’s  
28

1 purported explanation for her refusal to sign the Report, the primary purpose of the Joint Status  
2 Report is to assist the Court in issuing an appropriate trial date and pre-trial deadlines. The  
3 portions to which Plaintiff objected did not materially affect that decision. Dkt. #21. Moreover,  
4 the Court denied Plaintiff's motion to strike because a Scheduling Order had already been issued,  
5 and Plaintiff's dispute did not affect any of the dates set in that Order. *Id.*  
6

7 Plaintiff appears to believe that she will be prejudiced in some way if the Court allows  
8 the Joint Status Report to stand as it is written. The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's arguments  
9 and exhibits, but has no further reason to utilize the Joint Status Report, and Plaintiff will have  
10 opportunities to present the merits of her case as this litigation proceeds. The Court has no bias  
11 against Plaintiff simply because of the way the Joint Status Report was filed in this motion.  
12 However, no party should read this Order to imply that the Court has made any pre-judgment as  
13 to the merits of this case, or as to how any future motion will be decided.  
14

15 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration  
16 (Dkt. #78) is DENIED.  
17

18 DATED this 19 day of June 2017.  
19

20  
21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28